




Docket No.: 259687US-2 PCT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

GREGORY J. MAIER
(703) 413-3000
GMAIER@OBLON.COM

SURINDER SACHAR
(703) 413-3000
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/509,630

Applicants: Akira UMEDA

Filing Date: September 29, 2004

For: FREQUENCY CHARACTERISTICS MEASURING
METHOD AND DEVICE FOR ACCELERATION
SENSOR

Group Art Unit: 2856

Examiner: GARBER, C.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423



DOCKET NO: 259687US-2 PCT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF: :
AKIRA UMEDA : EXAMINER: GARBER, C.
SERIAL NO.: 10/509,630 :
FILED: SEPTEMBER 29, 2004 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2856
FOR: FREQUENCY CHARACTERISTICS
MEASURING METHOD AND DEVICE
FOR ACCELERATION SENSOR

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction requirement of August 25, 2005, Applicant elects, with traverse, the invention of Group II, Claims 36, 38, 40, 43, 53, 56, 58, 60, 63, and 74.

Applicant traverses the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, a Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that each of the claims could be examined without an undue burden, and thus each of the noted inventions and claims should be examined on their merits.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/SNS/des

I:\ATTY\SNS\25s\259687\259687US.REST.RESP.DOC